

### REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hinds.

The applicant has now amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 2 and claim 2 has now been canceled. Further, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 6 (the Examiner had indicated that claim 6 would be allowable if amended to include the limitations of independent claim 4). Claim 1 as now amended is not shown by Hinds, because Hinds does not show a waist belt nor a "D"-ring secured to the belt on the outward side of the belt nor does it show using a karabiner for connecting a handle to the "D"-ring. The Examiner had rejected claim 2, now included in claim 1, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being patentable over Hinds in view of Donohue. As noted by the Examiner, the Hinds reference does not disclose a device including a waist belt having buckle means. Donohue shows an exercise device in which a pair of handles are attached to the free ends of a rope or cord (18). However, Donohue does not show a "D"-ring and karabiner combination for connecting a handle to a waist belt. In Donohue the cord (18) is wrapped around the U-shaped guard (12). For this reason, it is believed that claim 1 as amended is now allowable over the cited art.

With regard to claim 3, claim 3 has been amended to be dependant on claim 1. If claim 1, as now amended, is allowable, claim 3 would also be allowable.

The Examiner rejected independent claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hopkins, Jr. Claim 4 has now been amended to specify that the second tubular section is mounted on the resilient tubing between the first free hand and the first tubular section and is positioned in spaced apart relation with the first tubular section. Further, claim 4 has been


amended to specify that the third tubular section is mounted on the resilient tubing between the second free end and the first tubular section and is positioned in spaced apart relation with the first tubular section. In Hopkins, Jr., a tubular section (24) is described as receiving the resilient cord (20) and the section (28) is described as a bushing protecting the cord (20) from rubbing against the end of sheathing (24). Thus, amended claim 4 presents subject matter distinguishable over the Hopkins, Jr. reference.

With respect to claims 5 through 7, the Examiner indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. It is believed that claim 4 is now allowable. It is also believed that claims 5 and 7 which are dependent on claim 4 would also be allowable.

With these amendments, applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance.

DATED: March 7, 2006  
Bozeman, Montana

Respectfully submitted,



Richard C. Conover  
Reg. No. 26,363  
104 E. Main St., Suite 404  
P.O. Box 1329  
Bozeman, Montana 59771-1329  
Tel. No. (406) 587-4240  
Attorney for Applicant